

### **Remarks/Arguments**

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this Application. Applicant's representative also thanks the Examiner for taking time to discuss the application. Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34-50 are pending after entry of the present Amendment.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 24 and 25 were objected to because the listing claims were not provided with a proper status. Claims 24 and 25 have been provided with a proper status. Accordingly, Applicants request the objections to claims 24 and 25 be removed.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:**

The Office has rejected claims 1-16, 19, 21, 23-27, 30, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,615,264 to Stoltz et al. (Stoltz). For at least the followings reasons, Stoltz fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as defined in independent claims 1,12, 23, and 34.

Stoltz discloses a method and apparatus for authentication and session management for a network in which a token is validated to give a user access to a session. This is not the same as Applicant's claimed invention because Applicant's claimed invention defines a method of accessing a session in which a first token is converted to an authenticated token. The authenticated token incorporates a user's identity and has a different content from the first token. Therefore, the authenticated is not the same as the first token that is presented to a system because it has a different content than the first token. Also, this same authenticated token can be created by any of a plurality of tokens that are presented to a

system for validation. Stoltz only discloses a method in which tokens are authenticated without conversion to a common, but different token that incorporates a user's identity and has a different content than the first token that was submitted for authentication.

Furthermore, the teachings of Stoltz would not function properly with Applicant's claimed invention. It is the common, different token in Applicant's claimed invention which enables a user to access a common session. Since sessions are associated with the common authenticated token, converting different first tokens to the common authenticated token allows a single session to be accessed by any number of different first tokens. If Stoltz's teachings were employed in Applicant's claimed invention, each token would not convert to a common token. This in turn would result in associating each token with its own session. Instead of having just one common session for multiple tokens assigned to a user, a token assigned to the user would only be able to access its associated session. If a user had multiple tokens or means for generating tokens, they would have to track which token was assigned to which session in order to access a desired session. Therefore, if Stoltz's teachings were applied to Applicant's claimed invention, the claimed invention would be useless for a user who misplaced a particular token and tried to access a desired session with a different token.

For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims are novel over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention, as defined in claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34, and 42-50 is novel over the cited prior art.

As noted above, the Stoltz fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Consequently, Stoltz can not be regarded under 35 USC §102(e) alone.

Instead, Stoltz can only be cited as art under a 35 USC §102(e)/103(c). Stoltz was assigned to the assignee of the present application, and the inventors of the present application also had a duty to assign to the same assignee. Consequently, under 35 USC § 103(c), Stoltz should be removed as a reference against the present application.

Accordingly, the claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11-16, 19, 23-25, 34, and 42-50 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art of record. Further, the Examiner has noted that claims 35 - 41 would be patentable if rewritten to include the features of claim 34. As Stoltz is removed as a reference, the Applicants submit that the claims 34-41 are now patentable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that a notice of allowance be issued for the claims.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP601). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Paul Link

Reg. No. 53,224

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone (408) 774-6911  
Facsimile (408) 749-6901  
**Customer No. 32291**